



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,771	04/20/2001	Michael T. Brown	10011539-1	2034

7590 09/30/2004
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TRONG NHAN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/839,771

Applicant(s)

BROWN, MICHAEL T.

Examiner

Jack P Nguyen

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/22/02
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are being examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art, US Pub 2002/0156895 (Applicant hereafter) in view of Adamson, 5,818,442 (Adamson hereafter).

4. As per claim 1, Applicant discloses a method for sharing contact information storing a user's contact information in a database from a local source [0002] or from a web server accessible over the network and enabling the person to access the user's contact information over the Internet [0005; www.ecardfile.com]. Applicant does not explicitly disclose security parameters for accessing or exchanging contact information. However, Adamson discloses a system to exchange and share user's contact information in the form of electronic business card (EBC) with remote authorized

Art Unit: 2152

network users via an electronic conferencing system (ECS) (abstract; col. 2, lines 10-15; col. 3, lines 50-52). Adamson further teaches upon joining a conference, any user can make a request for EBCs from other users. After receiving the request, the user can authorize to send the EBC to the requester who is already authorized to receive it (fig. 17, col. 7, lines 17-23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to be motivated to apply security parameters to private contact information in order to protect that information where only authorized users can have access to the data while excluding others from unauthorized access.

5. Claims 2-3 are rejected on basis of claim 1.

6. As per claim 4, Adamson teaches the step of receiving identification comprises receiving one of the person's email address (41f, fig. 5)).

7. As per claim 5, Adamson teaches the step of enabling the person to access the user's contact information comprises adding the person's identity to an approved list associated with the user's contact information (26, fig. 3, col. 4, lines 42-45; *user can select from a list of authorized network users to exchange and share data in an electronic conference managed by conference manager.*)

8. As per claim 6, Adamson teaches the step of receiving an indication from the user as to what pieces of contact information to make accessible to the authorized entity

(28, fig. 3, col. 4, lines 47-52; *via the profile, the user can create preferences on how any particular data is to be shared with other participants; furthermore, it is well known and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to be motivated to create a system where a person may desire to share his business contact information with all the conference participants while only sharing his home phone number with his direct team members for emergency purposes in order to protect his privacy*).

9. Claim 7 is rejected for the same rationale as claims 5 and 6. Since a user can authorize access to it's contact information when desired, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to revoke access of the information at anytime by removing the other user's name from the approved conference user list.

10. Claims 8-13 are rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

11. Claim 14 is rejected on the same basis of claims 1 and 6.

12. Claims 15, 16, and 18-20 are rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

13. Claim 17 is rejected on same basis as claim 7.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


- Douvikas et al, 6,691,158; Douvikas et al, 6,633,311 ; Ladd et al, 6,296,336 ;
Ausems et al, 6,434,403 ; Adamson et al, 5,717,863 ; Sakanashi et al,
6,460,764 ; Riddle, 6,151,619

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack P Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-4299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jpn


FRANTZ B. JEAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER